naming Federal registrars to apply the tests impartially. This would ease the constitutional argument about the bill, and it might accomplish about the same result as the banning of all literacy tests in the areas to be covered.

At least it is salutary to have the Judiciary Committees examine these aspects of the bill with great care. The necessity for enactment of a strong bill to end denial of the franchise on racial grounds has been established beyond challenge. The details of the bill are still open to debate. We hope that Congress will substitute Federal action for State action so far as it is necessary to guarantee equality at the polls, without any unnecessary encroachment upon the right of the States to fix the qualifications of voters.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Mar. 26, 1965]

BUT VOTE BILL DOES NEED ANALYSIS

In his speech at Cleveland Wednesday, the Reverend Martin Luther King expressed hope that President Johnson's bill on voting rights would not suffer "paralysis from analysis."

Nevertheless, various researchers outside the Government have analyzed it, including Congressional Quarterly, Inc., I am indebted to it for most of the statistics I shall refer to.

If many Congressmen analyzed the bill with equal care, they might agree with Monday's Wall Street Journal that it is an "immoral bill." In my opinion, it needs revision, and its passage should be "paralyzed" long enough for that purpose.

The formulas for applying the proposed remedies for voter discrimination certainly do not establish uniform, nationwide standards. In fact, they establish new discriminations between States which, in turn, invite discrimination between persons. The new discriminations themselves seem to violate the letter and the spirit of the Constitution.

Most obvious of these discriminations is the outlawing of every kind of literacy tests in a few States, while leaving them in force in other States. Certainly, no State should be permitted to manipulate literacy tests to discriminate against literate Negroes, as some Southern States have done, most noticeably, at the moment, Alabama.

But the Supreme Court has repeatedly declared, and in recent years, that States have the right to exclude abjectly illiterate people from voting, whatever their race or color. In fact, all Northern States with literacy tests would be permitted to keep them, so far as the Johnson bill is concerned.

In my opinion, such tests represent good public policy when reasonably drafted and honestly applied. Total illiteracy should no more be a qualification for voting than feebleimindedness or mental irresponsibility. The new bill recognizes the right of States to exclude felons and legally committed mental defectives.

This bill provides for Federal takeover of registration and vote counting only where both of two conditions exist simultaneously. One condition is that less than half the voting-age population of a State or subdivision shall have voted in the 1964 election. States may still set the voting age. The number of the voting age population, for the bill's purpose, is the Census Bureau estimate for November 1, 1964. The second condition is the existence in such a State of any literacy test whatever.

One of the illogical discriminations built into the new bill is the different treatment provided for some subdivisions, such as counties, where both conditions for Federal intervention prevail. Take a literacy-test State where more than half the voting-age population of the whole State voted in 1964. Then the Federal treatment applies only to subdivisions where less than half voted.

But the rule is different in a literacy-test State where less than half the voting-age population of the whole State voted in 1964. In such a State, Federal authority may take over in every county, including counties where more than half the voting-age population may have voted.

If the State has no literacy test at all, no part of its area is subject to the new law no matter how small the proportion of actual voters to the number of voting age.

There is an appeal procedure through which some States or subdivisions might escape from the proposed Federal controls. Such a unit might file suit before a three-judge court in the District of Columbia to prove that it had not actually discriminated against any potential voters on account of their race or color at any time within 10 years.

This is the provision under which it is now being assumed that Alaska could get out from under. It might also rescue the one county in Maine, the one county in Arizona, and the one county in Idaho which appear to be threatened by the double-barrelled formula.

Previous court findings of discrimination make certain that Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Georgia, would immediately get the full Federal treatment. By coincidence—or is it?—all these States cast their electoral votes against Lyndon B. Johnson last November.

Two other States within the formula—South Carolina and Virginia—have no court findings of racial discrimination on the record. But the Government, it is reported, is prepared to produce evidence that they have discriminated against Negroes in registration and voting.

South Carolina delivered its electoral votes to Senator Barry Goldwater, Virginia to Mr. Johnson. Presumably the Government would press its case for a finding of actual discrimination with equal zeal against both.

However, the six Southern States mentioned above were not the only ones where less than half the people of voting age voted in 1964. In Texas the vote was only 44.4 percent—which is less than the 47.3 percent in Louisiana and only a fraction more than Georgia's 43.2. In Arkansas, the percentage was 49.9 percent.

The vote was less than 50 percent in each of 137 counties in Texas, but neither the counties nor the State would be disturbed because there is no literacy test. They would be treated like Alabama if they had tests like California's or New York's, which the new bill does not propose to void.

Both Texas and Arkansas delivered their electoral votes to Mr. Johnson. The attorney general tells congressman that the low rate of voting in these two States was due to voter apathy, rather than discrimination.

Still, it is only 16 months since an important part of Texas was widely denounced as a very hell-hole of racism and bigotry. It is only a few years since Federal troops were in Arkansas to put a few Negro children in a school.

Can one honestly assume that no traces of bigotry linger in either of these States to restrict the turnout of voters or the honesty of the count? So Mr. Johnson seems to assume. At any rate, the power structure of his home state would not be touched by his proposed law.

[From the Charlotte News, Mar. 16, 1965]

A SPEECH AND A BILL

Lyndon Johnson's most powerful speech as President of the United States raises a single, deeply troubling question: How can the President's stirring words be reconciled with what is known about the civil rights bill he proposes to introduce to Congress?

On the one hand, there is a speech full of the stuff of unity, alive with a rhetoric of freedom all Americans can applaud. On the other hand, there are the outlines of one of the most divisive pieces of legislation ever sent to a Congress of the United States. How can the words be squared with the means?

As a piece of speechmaking, the President's address to Congress last night is hard to fault. If it lacked the eloquence of a Roosevelt or the burnished phrasemaking of a Kennedy, it did a Johnson proud. It was simple, direct, and, above all, forceful. It conveyed the unmistakable impression of a President who knows his mind and means to have his way. It was weakest at the end, overlong and inclining, finally, to tedium and the pseudopiety of some of the President's less fortunate Great Society speeches. Still, the overall effect was one of raw, impressive power.

Much in the speech stands without contest. It is true that Americans have been denied the right to vote. It is true that there is no cause for pride in the events that have taken place in Selma this past week. It is true—above all, it is true—that what we confront is not a northern or a southern problem, but an American problem. And it is true that to evade this problem is to deny America and much that has made this country great.

The President went beyond the self-evident to confront the hard task of understanding this diverse and sorely divided country. He bade Americans remember that the people of our Buffalos and our Birminghams see their problems differently and that in each city men and women of both races must behave in such a way that they can live together afterwards. He recognized that the issues are not quite so clear cut as the professional civil rights forces would have us believe: That there are grave issues of keeping order and peace in our country, and that free speech and free assembly are not licenses to irresponsibility. All this the President noted; all this needed badly to be noted.

But what of his central purpose before the Congress? What of the civil rights bill he proposes? Only sharp edges, cloaked in shadow, where visible. He would establish "a simple, uniform standard" for voting "in all elections—National, State, and local." He would "provide for voters to be voted by officials of the U.S. Government if local officials refuse." His manner was grim, at times almost menacing. "Experience has shown this is the only path. * * *" And he brought the Congress to its feet, catching the mood of steamrolling assent: "There must be no delay, no hesitation, no compromise without purpose."

The President's tone was of a man who does not wish to quibble over details: Pass a bill that will allow Negroes to vote everywhere and be done with it, he seemed to say. He was no more specific than that.

But the bill that administration officials have been discussing scarcely sounds like a measure designed to unite all Americans. It would single out Southern States or counties by the single, all-obliterating fact that they have fewer than 50 percent of "eligible" people voting or registered in the November 1964 elections. It would strip these States or counties of virtually all standards for voting except age and residence. It would provide for selecting Federal officials to see to it that everyone regarded as eligible by these standards was registered.

So the President's "single, uniform standard" apparently amounts to a Federal voting rule applied to all elections from the most humble local office on up. Standards of literacy—even the broad sixth-grade educational standards embodied in the Civil Rights Act of 1964—would go out the window. The States so treated would cease to shoulder any responsibility for their voters. Uncle Sam would do it all.

The bill thus described amounts to the most arrant discrimination against a few States in the name of the many. It would excuse any infringement of voting rights in most States while removing all control of voting from some States. It has the flavor of doubtful constitutionality. Worse, it is

bitterly divisive by nature; it would set the Buffalos and the Birminghams farther apart rather than pull them closer together.

President Johnson plays the American people false when he says that "experience has plainly shown this is the only path." This bill did not spring out of experience with the voting mechanisms of the several States. It sprang hot and straight from the streets of Selma. It was written in the streets, out of the substance of angry protest. It is an invitation to retaliate against the Nation's Selmas with punitive law.

The President touched on the history of voting rights legislation in his speech. He told of the 1957 law that empowers the attorney general to seek injunctions against obstruction of voting rights. He mentioned the difficulties of enforcement and the 1960 law that broadened enforcement powers, enabling courts to act more swiftly when a "pattern of discrimination" was found.

But he said nothing about the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which lies virtually unused on the statute books. Under this law State officials are required to set the same standards for all people seeking registration, to disregard minor errors and omissions and to presume that a person with a sixth grade education is literate. The Atorney General is empowered to bring voting suits before a three-judge court with appeals going directly to the Supreme Court to speed the process.

This law has not been tried out seriously. What might have been a legal test in Selma turned out instead to be a test of power, a desperate political contest that has set the stage for the wide-ranging legislation the President now seeks.

By asking for that legislation in the peremptory language he used last night, President Johnson has succumbed to that pressure. He has allowed the office of the Presidency to be used as a pawn in the struggle that is going on. He has allowed the ardent demonstrators and the foolish Governor Wallace to set the stage for blind law. And he has urged the Congress to pass this blind law without so much as a hard look.

Let us hope that Congress refuses to pass this sort of bill. If the great mass of statutes now on the books is not sufficient to give every American who can meet reasonable State qualifications the right to vote—then the law needs to be amended.

But the answer is not to impose an iron Federal rule on a few Southern States, to invite the ghosts of occupation to revisit their old haunts. Such a law would not be a charter of freedom but a bill of indictment against a section of the country. It would do infinite harm.

OPPOSITION TO CLOSING OF VETERANS HOSPITALS AND OFFICES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Commissioners Court of Grayson County, Tex., recently adopted a resolution condemning the closing of veterans hospitals and offices. I share the views expressed by the commissioners; and in order that other Senators may be advised of the seriousness with which thoughtful Texans regard this matter. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF COUNTY OF GRAYSON, STATE OF TEXAS

Whereas the commissioners court of Grayson County, Tex., being in a regular meeting in the city of Sherman, Tex., this the 23d day of March A.D. 1965; and

Whereas the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has proposed that a number of hospitals and other facilities, including the McKinney Veterans' Administration Hospital, be closed as an economic measure; and

Whereas we feel that the veterans of this county will be greatly inconvenienced in that they will have to travel a great distance to receive hospitalization, and we also feel that the closing of the hospitals and/or other veterans' facilities would be inconsistent with the President's program of total war on poverty: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we do strongly condemn the closing of any of the hospitals and/or other facilities and urge that this proposal be rescinded; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, a copy to the President of the United States of America, a copy to each Member of Congress from this district, and that a copy be spread upon the minutes of this court.

LES TRIBBLE,
County Judge.
M. C. HESTAND,
Commissioner, Precinct No. 1.
THOMAS MCKEE,
Commissioner, Precinct No. 2.
J. B. WALKER,
Commissioner, Precinct No. 3.
O. L. WILSON,
Commissioner, Precinct No. 4.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the sixth district convention of the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Texas Department, recently adopted a most important and thoughtful resolution concerning the administration's proposed closing of veterans' hospitals and offices. I fully agree with the convention members that the closings are unwise; and in order that other Senators may be advised of the views of the convention, I ask that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC., DEPARTMENT OF STATE OF TEXAS

Whereas the Veterans' Administration announcement of January 13, 1965, in Washington, D.C., that it would close 11 hospitals, 4 domiciliary homes, and 17 regional offices in 23 States by June 30, 1965, met sharp reaction and strong protest by the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Inc., as well as other veterans' organizations; and

Whereas a number of Members of Congress, including our two U.S. Senators and most all other Members of Congress from Texas, have brought promises of action with regard to the closing of hospitals and regional offices in McKinney, Lubbock, and San Antonio; and

Whereas the delegates and membership of the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Inc., at this convention assembled at Hearne, Tex., support the stand taken by the Senators and Congressmen from Texas in delaying the closing of the stated facilities in Texas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention go on record as favoring the removal of the Veterans' Administration from the control of the executive branch of our Government and place it under the supervision of the U.S. Congress, who created it and represents the people from all 50 States of this Union; and be it further

Resolved, That A—the veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Inc., in convention of the Sixth District of Texas do hereby express our appreciation for the action taken by the Texas Legislature in the passing of a memorial resolution opposing the closing of the Veterans' Administration regional offices and hospitals in Texas; and B—that these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of this convention, and copies mailed to the President of the United States, and Vice President, members of the Texas congressional delegation and department commander, Veterans World War I of the United States of America.

Signed at Hearne, Tex., this the 21st day of March 1965.

Attest:

S. B. PICKARD,
Sixth District Quartermaster and Adjutant.
W. C. HENDRIX,
Sixth District Commander.

FIREARMS LEGISLATION

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I was happy to join the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] in sponsoring S. 14, a bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act. The major provisions of that bill, as Senators know, are designed to keep mail-order guns from criminals, narcotic addicts, mental defectives, and juveniles. It does not prohibit interstate commerce in firearms, but does require notification of the proper local authorities when a gun is ordered by mail. It specifically omits serial numbers from the notification to local authorities, in keeping with my feeling that no Federal law should require registration of firearms.

As Senators also know, the President of the United States on March 8 sent to Congress a message in which he called for a flat prohibition on shipment of firearms in interstate commerce, except among importers, manufacturers, and dealers licensed by the Treasury Department, and for limits on importation of firearms. The President's proposals obviously would go much further in regulating firearms than would S. 14, which I cosponsored. I was somewhat distressed to find that the senior Senator from Connecticut on March 22 introduced the President's proposed legislation. It had been my sincere hope that S. 14 would be favorably acted upon in this Congress. I believe that S. 14 is a moderate, workable, and effective approach to a very serious problem; and I was both pleased to be a cosponsor and prepared to work with Senator DODD in perfecting and passing the measure.

I sincerely hope that the introduction of the President's bill by the Senator from Connecticut does not signify a withdrawal of his support for S. 14 and an intention to push the President's much more stringent measure. I cannot believe that it is necessary or desirable to completely ban interstate traffic in firearms or to establish the prohibitions on sales by retail dealers which the President's bill asks, at least until the more moderate approach of S. 14 has been tried for a reasonable length of time. If this is tried and is proven not sufficient to cope with the serious problem at which it is aimed—that of keeping guns out of the hands of those who are most likely to abuse this privilege—then I would be willing to consider alternatives. But I will resist proposed legislation which would be a deterrent to the ownership of firearms by responsible citizens, as the Presidential proposal is.

Mr. President, while I am on the subject of firearms legislation, let me set the record straight on S. 14, since there seems to be abroad a good deal of misinformation about that bill.

First, I believe that there is a necessity for some type of legislation in this area. FBI figures for 1963, the last year for which it has its complete figures, show 8,500 homicides during the year. Of that number, 56 percent were committed by the use of firearms. Those were 4,760 deaths in 1963 in the United States attributable to misuse of firearms. Furthermore, guns accounted for 96 percent of the deaths of police officers incurred in line of duty. In light of the growing traffic in mail-order guns and the testimony linking those guns much too often to individuals who abuse gun ownership, I believe that something like S. 14 is now a must.

It has been said by some that S. 14 would outlaw, license, or otherwise impede the sportsman or other legitimate user of guns in acquiring a firearm. In fact, the bill is aimed at keeping guns out of the hands of criminals, mental defectives, narcotic addicts, and juveniles. It would perhaps be a inconvenience to a would-be purchaser of a mail-order gun to execute an affidavit and have it notarized, as would be required. But approval of the order by some Government official is not required before the gun can be shipped, as has been stated by some persons. All that is required is that the seller wait until he is informed that the affidavit has been delivered to the local law-enforcement officer.

Furthermore, S. 14 does not require registration of guns. There was included in S. 14 a specific provision that the seller would not furnish the serial number of a mail-order gun with the information he sends to the local police. I understand that this provision was inserted in the bill at the request of the National Rifle Association, a group which I am sure shares my feeling that no Federal law should require the registration of firearms.

Some have said that S. 14 is unconstitutional, infringing on the right of the people to keep and bear arms. On the contrary, it is my judgment that S. 14, since it deals only with interstate sale or shipment of guns, is clearly within the power of Congress, under the commerce clause. It does not even attempt to deal with local determinations of who may own a gun. It leaves State and local governments free to handle their problems in this area as they may see fit, and sets no prohibition on purchase of a gun by anyone, other than through interstate commerce. I point out, too, that New York's very stringent Sullivan law, requiring a police permit to own a handgun for any reason, has been held constitutional by both New York courts and the U.S. Supreme Court.

Some opponents of S. 14 have even said that it is hasty and ill conceived. The fact is that this bill is a product of 3 years of thorough study and discussion with legislators, law-enforcement officers and agencies, representatives of the firearms industry, importers, representatives of common carriers, and others. I quote from the March issue of Guns magazine:

Senator DODD did invite representatives of many branches of the firearms industry and of the shooting sports to Washington to discuss measures of firearms control—those discussions were long, outspoken on both sides. They included word-by-word study of the existing statutes as well as the proposed amendments, including testimony from leading law-enforcement agencies—the discussions were fair, and—subcommittee members were amazingly amenable to deletions of or changes in their proposals.

Contrast this with the slapdash, blanket approach of the administration's bill, S. 1592, which took form within 2 weeks.

It is also said, as an argument against S. 14, that if a criminal wants a gun badly enough, he has ways to acquire it. This may be true; but such a statement sounds to me more like an argument in favor of the President's blanket approach outlawing all interstate shipments of guns to individuals, rather than an argument against S. 14. I personally do not believe that either approach will absolutely cut off the availability of guns to criminals; but if a proposed law will make it more difficult for a criminal to acquire a weapon, without unduly infringing on the rights of legitimate users, then I favor it. S. 14 seems to me to fit this description; but the administration proposal does not.

Mr. President, I hope the Commerce Committee will hold hearings on S. 14, if further hearings on this approach are needed, and will report the bill out of the committee. I believe it is a good bill, and certainly much preferable to S. 1592.

NEW TRENDS IN THE FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, on February 25 of this year, the Capitol Hill Chapter of the Federal Bar Association heard an address by Mr. Myrl Alexander, the new Director of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons.

I recently read a copy of his address, and was impressed by the wide variety of responsibilities and programs involved in the management of our national penitentiary system. I was particularly pleased by Mr. Alexander's interest in the work-release program adopted by some States, under which penitentiary inmates are employed outside the prison during the day, if they are evaluated as suitable for such release.

As chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, I held hearings last week on S. 1319, the District of Columbia Work Release Act. Mr. Alexander's interest in this program, for possible adoption by the Federal prison system, is particularly timely.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD biographical data on Myrl E. Alexander and the text of his address before the Capitol Hill Chapter of the Federal Bar Association.

There being no objection, the memorandum and the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA: MYRL E. ALEXANDER, DIRECTOR, U.S. BUREAU OF PRISONS

Myrl E. Alexander was sworn in as Director of the Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Department of Justice, on August 29, 1964. He has had more than 30 years experience in the Federal prison service, including 14 years as Assistant Director, from 1947 to 1961.

Mr. Alexander served as professor of correctional administration and director of the Study of Crime Delinquency and Corrections at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, from 1961 to 1964.

He was born in Dayton, Ohio, on August 23, 1909. He obtained an A.B. degree from Manchester College, North Manchester, Ind., in 1930, pursued graduate studies in sociology at Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa., and also holds an LL.D. degree from Manchester College.

Mr. Alexander joined the prison service as warden's assistant at the Atlanta, Ga., Federal Penitentiary in July 1931. He worked as a parole officer at the Lewisburg, Pa., penitentiary, supervisor of parole for the Bureau of Prisons, and associate warden at Lewisburg, before his promotion to warden of the Federal Correctional Institution at Danbury, Conn., in May 1943.

In 1945 and 1946, he was on special assignment as chief of prisons for the Office of Military Government in Germany. In March 1947, he assumed the post of Assistant Director of the Bureau of Prisons which he held until retiring to assume his academic duties in 1961.

Mr. Alexander was president of the American Correctional Association in 1956. He is author of the book "Jail Administration," a survey of good practices of jail management published in 1957, and is a frequent contributor to professional journals. He has served as special consultant to many State correctional systems. In 1961 he represented the United States at the International Study Group on Correctional Institution Design and Architecture in London.

He is a member of the Professional Advisory Council of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Among his other affiliations are the American Correctional Association, American Society for Public Administration, American Academy of Political and Social Science, and the National Jail Association.

Mr. Alexander was married in 1934 to the former Lorene Shoemaker of Mifflinburg, Pa. They have two children and three grandchildren.

"IF I HAD THE WINGS OF AN ANGEL"

(Address by Myrl E. Alexander, Director, U.S. Bureau of Prisons, to the Capitol Hill chapter, Federal Bar Association, Feb. 25, 1965)

I am pleased to be here on Capitol Hill to discuss our Federal correctional system. My esteemed predecessor, Jim Bennett, whom many of you know, came to the Hill many times during his 27-year tenure as Director of Prisons to state his case for improved programs and facilities, and to report on progress and innovations. I am, of course, continuing that policy, and am glad to have this extracurricular Capitol Hill forum.

As we move into age of moonshots and cybernetics, we in corrections are struck by some stark contrasts that require attention from concerned citizens everywhere.

The world has become extremely small in terms of travel and communication. Colonial countries are emerging into new nations without the experience of growth accomplishment during the industrial revolution. Old concepts are being tested and

tried. Human rights and human dignity are emphasized and accelerated. Economic relocation of all kinds is taking place. New discoveries in medicine and public health have produced a world population explosion. Within a decade or two, knowledgeable people prophesy that 10 percent of the people will be capable of producing all food and products needed to sustain life on earth. Leisure time will increase beyond even our present imagination.

But today we are confronted by problems of unemployment, school dropouts, poverty in the midst of plenty, and an increase in our social problems including crime and delinquency.

We can no longer accept slow correctional evolution. Nor can we afford to await change through natural attrition and development. We must produce change in corrections by planned design. Planned change is the key to the corrections of tomorrow—beginning today.

When I was a boy and lived on an Ohio farm, we were satisfied with production of 40 or 50 bushels of corn per acre. We were satisfied with hogs that produced one-third lard at slaughter time. But phenomenal changes in agriculture were produced when genetics laws were applied. The development of species by natural evolution was outmoded. We must likewise produce planned change in corrections by application of the same principle.

This need for an accelerated correctional change is the challenge before us today. It is a part of the larger effort to reduce or eliminate our major social problems of overpopulation, food, mental illness, alcoholism, poverty—all of which produce crime and delinquency as their ultimate products. And so we in corrections, confronted by new and emerging problems in our society, need to take inventory and evaluate correction role in the emerging social order. Early in that re-evaluation of corrections several critical facts will become abundantly clear.

First, the causes of crime and delinquency lie deep within the community. Behavorial problems are usually symptoms of grave problems in early life. Therefore, we in corrections need to have far greater insights into the causes of delinquency and criminal behavior if we are to successfully treat and train offenders.

2. We will recognize that corrections is a continuous and closely interwoven process, no one element of which can be successfully isolated from the other. We have often subscribed to this fact, but mostly in principle. Juvenile detention, the jail, the court, probation, halfway houses, juvenile institutions, penitentiaries, parole, work release problems, prerelease programs, academic education, vocational training, group therapy, are inseparable in their total impact on delinquent and criminal behavior. Yet, in practice, these correctional processes are all too often separate and disparate; only the client as he passes from one process to another senses the discordant and uncoordinated procedures involved in correctional practice.

3. Again, a critical self-examination will reveal that corrections, unit by unit and process by process, is usually self-satisfied. We simply aren't willing to critically examine the true results of our work. All too often a correctional institution operates on the implied principle that the institution is managed and exists for its own sake. If our correctional institutions were to serve as a guide and a model to the automobile industry, the Ford Motor Co. today would be struggling to move from production of the model T to the model A Ford. Honest research and development—in the same sense that it is used in industry or the defense establishment—would produce phenomenal and explosive results in corrections. We must face the fact that our work today is grossly inefficient.

4. We will also discover that our standards for personnel recruitment, training and development are grossly inadequate to meet the challength of tomorrow. In institution after institution we seem to assume that the challenge of adverse human behavior can be met if the institution is headed by a warden who has had some years of practical experience in corrections; if the staff includes some caseworkers, a few schoolteachers, a clinical phychologist, a part-time psychiatrist, a medical officer, and a few practical on-the-job vocational training instructors; all of whom are buttressed by a guard force representing 75 to 85 percent of personnel. If this same staffing policy was applied to a general hospital, a psychiatric hospital, or a school system, we would be horror stricken. A correctional institution, like a school or a hospital or an industry, simply can't be any better and more efficient than the people who operate it. This very year there are 25,000 jobs in the correctional field open to persons who have bachelor's and/or master's degrees but which are now unfilled or filled with people with inferior qualifications—simply because the trained manpower isn't immediately available. And we do all too little about subprofessional training for the lineworkers in corrections.

5. We will discover that even as the roots of criminal and delinquent behavior lie deep within the community, so must we look to the community for broadened use of its resources. Much of corrections stands withdrawn and isolated from the normal resources of community life. We must prepare and guide and control our clientel for community adjustment rather than adjustment to probation or to the correctional institution, or to parole.

Those are five critical and important discoveries which will be soon apparent, if and when we have the guts to examine and appraise our correctional processes. And when these recognitions occur, then we will be ready to begin the most difficult task ever faced in corrections: Directing realistic planned change to eliminate and overcome these longstanding and deep-rooted problems which thwart and confuse us.

What is the real significance of these discoveries about corrections? What changes can we produce?

I believe that we must have some clear understandings of the causes of crime and delinquency. It is no longer sufficient for a probation officer, or a jailer, or a warden, or a judge, or a correctional officer to assume that a convicted offender stole a car and therefore we must rehabilitate him. Indeed, we want to do anything but rehabilitate the offenders committed for correctional treatment and training. If "rehabilitate" means to restore to a state of former usefulness, ability, or performance, we're kidding ourselves about rehabilitation. As a matter of fact, the job of corrections is almost inevitably one of reestablishing and accelerating the development, the education, the training, and the emotional maturation of people who have been socially, educationally, and emotionally retarded.

And we really can't correct human behavior, unless we understand why our clients behave as they do rather than as normally mature persons. This is what the work of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime is all about.

And here in the spring of 1965 this is a substantial part of President Johnson's war on poverty. Think for a moment: Do the current discussions about school dropouts, unemployed youth, deteriorated slum areas of large cities, aid to dependent children, public welfare—do those have a familiar ring to you? Of course they do, because we in corrections have spent our lives dealing with the behavior of children, youth, and adults who are the products of these social problems which have now been discovered anew and publicized. The great majority of delinquents and criminals have been school dropouts. They have come from socially inadequate families. They have come from the ranks of the unemployed. They are the social misfits who are the products of these conditions and influences.

Yes, all correctional workers must become increasingly understanding and knowledgeable about the causes of crime and delinquency. This is not a static body of knowledge, but one which is growing and expanding and developing. The modern correctional worker must keep current with new facts, new insights, and new theories of delinquency causation as they develop and are proven or disproven. We do not treat the car thief, we treat the undeveloped and deprived youth. We do not treat the check forger, we treat the alcoholic, the unemployed, the uneducated. We cannot work from the limited perspective of symptomatic behavior. We cannot meet emotion with emotion. We can no longer afford to treat symptoms.

Corrections is rarely practiced as a continuous process in this country. An offender is arrested and placed in a jail. The jail may be—and often is—the most socially infectious place in the community. He may be there until trial if he is indigent and without resources, even though he might be quite responsible for appearance at the time of trial. If he has means or friends, or influence, he will be out on bond awaiting trial. When guilt has been determined he may be immediately sentenced. On the other hand he may await a presentence investigation by a probation officer before commitment. If he lives in a rural area, probation may be nominal or even not available. If in another area, he may be under the guidance and control of a skilled probation officer. He may be committed back to a county jail for a short sentence or to a workhouse.

Then, too, he may be committed to a major penitentiary or reformatory. Sometimes the probation office will make the results of a presentence investigation available to the institution which he is sentenced. More often than not when received at an institution he may answer a few cursory questions on his vital statistics. He may or may not be tested. He may be given a fair diagnostic interview by a caseworker, or he may not. He may be assigned to work the first day he is there or he may be held in admission-orientation unit awaiting complete social and diagnostic studies.

He may learn more about the institution and how to get along in it from inmates than he ever does from the staff. He may be assigned a realistic vocational training program, but more likely will be assigned to something called meeting institutional needs and placed on a nebulous waiting list for some time. He may be enrolled in school and taught by another inmate in certain routine subjects at the elementary or high school level. He perhaps will be tested. He may even pass a general education development test and get a high school diploma. But more likely if he does, he will never have been in a class taught by a skilled teacher who brings to him a sense of the wonder of science in an orderly world, the beauty of a poem, an appreciation of man's long histories and struggles, the meaning of life in a free democratic society, or any other of those facets of education which meet and attack and solve the problems of the educationally and emotionally deprived persons. He may see a psychiatrist on entrance and again sometime if he exhibts some kind of bizarre behavior. On the other hand, he may never see a psychiatrist.

When he reaches parole eligibility he may have a hearing before a part-time parole board member who is able to spend only a few minutes taking a look at his case. He may appear before a full-time parole board member, interested and skilled in evaluating